

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, and 20 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection:

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on July 12, 2005. During the interview, the parties agreed that should claim 8 be amended to recite "an electronic device comprising...a controlling device that prohibits the device from performing camera functions...", that the amended claim 8 would overcome the references as cited. The parties further agreed that claim 20, as currently pending, is patentable over the teachings of *Tanaka* and *Fumio* as neither *Tanaka* or *Fumio* either alone, or in combination, teach or suggest a function unrelated to functions of a digital camera.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments and arguments included herein are made further to the agreements and discussions had during the interview.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Tanaka et al.* (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0191096); rejected claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka et al.* in view of *Kiyokawa* (USP 6,204,877); rejected claims 8-10, 12-13, 16, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka et al.* in view of *Fumio et al.* (USP 6,515,705); rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka et al.* in view of *Fumio et al.* and further in view of *Oeda et al.* (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0012071); rejected claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Tanaka et al. in view of *Fumio et al.* and *Kiyokawa*; and rejected claims 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka et al.* in view of *Fumio et al.* and *Steinberg et al.* (USP 6,006,039). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite an electronic device comprising a mode setting device that sets one of a first mode for a function which is unrelated to camera functions and a second mode which is related to camera functions; and a controlling device that prohibits the electronic device from performing camera functions when the first mode is set by the mode setting device.

During the Interview, the parties agreed that *Tanaka et al.* failed to teach or suggest a function unrelated to functions of a digital camera. Based upon this agreement, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by *Tanaka et al.* As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7 and 17-19 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103

During the Interview, the parties agreed that claim 20 is not rendered obviousness based upon the teachings of *Tanaka et al.* and *Fumio*. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 21-23 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 20 at least based on their dependency on claim 20.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 8 in accordance with the proposed claim amendments discussed during the interview on July 12, 2005. The parties agreed that if claim 8 was amended in this fashion, that the claim would overcome the outstanding claim rejection. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 9-16 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 8 at least based on their dependency on claim 8.

Conclusion


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Date: July 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant